secured creditors. As the Debtor and his spouse have filed a long series of bankruptcy cases in

order to frustrate foreclosure, Trinity requests that the Court deny confirmation of the Debtor's

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IRV #4838-3436-3012 v1

3 patently unconfirmable Plan.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 1. Trinity's claim is evidenced by a Home Equity Line of Credit Agreement and Disclosure Statement, executed by Debtor Jack Damusca and dated September 21, 2006, in the original principal sum of \$46,800 (the "HELOC"). A copy of the HELOC is attached to Trinity's proof of claim no. 2-1 (the "Proof of Claim") as filed on the Court's claims register ("CCR") in the instant bankruptcy case and incorporated herein by reference.
- 2. The HELOC is secured by a second deed of trust (the "Deed of Trust"), executed by Jack Damusca and Ginette Damusca, Husband and Wife as Joint Tenants, and encumbering the real property commonly known as 3512 Floresta Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90043 (the "Property"). A copy of the Deed of Trust is attached to Trinity's proof of claim no. 2-1 as filed in the instant bankruptcy case and incorporated herein by reference.
- 3. Subsequently, the HELOC was assigned to Trinity. Trinity, directly or through an agent, is in possession of the original promissory note. See CCR, Claim No. 2-1.
- 4. On January 21, 2011, Debtor, Jack Damusca (the "Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and was assigned Bankruptcy Case Number 2:11-bk-12745-SK (the "First Case").
- 5. On May 27, 2011, the Court converted the case to a Chapter 7 [First Case Docket No. 20].
 - 6. On July 12, 2011, the Chapter 7 Trustee filed his Report of No Distribution.
- 7. On October 19, 2011, the Court issued the Debtor's discharge [First Case Docket No. 321.
- 8. On January 2, 2012, the Debtor filed a voluntary petition under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and was assigned Bankruptcy Case Number 2:12-bk-10033-NB (the "Second Case") [Second Case Docket No. 1].
 - 9. On January 2, 2012, the Debtor filed his Chapter 13 Plan [Second Case Docket

- 16. On August 27, 2012, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Statement of Related Cases, Summary of Schedules, Statistical Summary of Certain Liabilities, Notice of Available Chapters, Schedules A-J, Declaration Concerning Schedules, Statement of Financial Affairs, Certification of Employment Income, Disclosure of Compensation of Attorney for Debtor, Verification of Creditor Matrix, and Addendum to Chapter 13 Plan [Third Case Docket No. 10].
- 17. On August 27, 2012, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Chapter 13 Plan [Third Case Docket No. 11].
- 18. On November 5, 2012, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Request for Voluntary Dismissal of Chapter 13 Case [Third Case Docket No. 20].
- 19. On November 6, 2012, the Court issued its Order and Notice of Dismissal [Third Case Docket No. 22].
 - 20. On March 19, 2013, the case was closed [Third Case Docket No. 28].
 - 21. On November 19, 2012, just 13 days after voluntarily dismissing her prior

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

22.

- 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21

22

- 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27 28

IRV #4838-3436-3012 v1

- Case Docket No. 3]. 23. On November 21, 2012, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Imposing a Stay or Continuing the Automatic Stay [Fourth Case Docket No. 7].
- 24. On December 19, 2012, the Court issued its Order Granting Motion for Order Imposing a Stay or Continuing the Automatic Stay [Fourth Case Docket No. 13].
- 25. On January 7, 2013, the Chapter 13 Trustee filed her Objection to Confirmation of Chapter 13 Plan [Fourth Case Docket No. 17].

On November 19, 2012, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Chapter 13 Plan [Fourth

- 26. On April 9, 2013, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Notice of Conversion to Chapter 7 [Fourth Case Docket No. 20].
- 27. On April 9, 2013, Senior Lienholder Nationstar Mortgage ("Nationstar") filed its Objection to Confirmation of Chapter 13 Plan [Fourth Case Docket No. 21].
- 28. On April 9, 2013, the Court converted the case to a Chapter 7 [Fourth Case Docket No. 22].
 - 29. On June 4, 2013, the Chapter 7 Trustee filed his Report of No Distribution.
- 30. On June 26, 2013, Nationstar filed its Notice of Motion and Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay [Fourth Case Docket No. 34].
- 31. On July 15, 2013, the Court issued the Discharge of Debtor [Fourth Case Docket No. 39].
- 32. On July 30, 2013, the Court issued the Order Granting Nationstar's Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay [Fourth Case Docket No. 41].
 - 33. On September 4, 2013, the case was closed [Fourth Case Docket No. 43].
- 34. The Damuscas defaulted again under the terms of their HELOC and Deed of Trust. On March 8, 2017, Trinity recorded a Notice of Default and Election to Sell.
 - 35. On July 19, 2017, a Notice of Sale was recorded with the original foreclosure sale

1].

- 6 7
- 8
- 10
- 1112
- 13
- 1415
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 2021
- 2223
- 24

25

- 2627
- 28

- 37. On August 11, 2017, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Chapter 13 Plan [Fifth Case Docket No. 2].
- 38. On September 14, 2017, the Chapter 13 Trustee filed her Objection to Confirmation of Chapter 13 Plan [Fifth Case Docket No. 16].
- 39. On October 6, 2017, the Debtor's Spouse filed her First Amended Chapter 13 Plan [Fifth Case Docket No. 17].
- 40. On October 27, 2017, Trinity Financial Services, LLC ("Trinity") filed its Objection to Confirmation of Chapter 13 Plan [Fifth Case Docket No. 21].
- 41. On May 11, 2018, Trinity filed its Notice of Motion and Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay (the "Motion") [Fifth Case Docket No. 28].
- 42. On May 22, 2018, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Response to the Motion [Fifth Case Docket No. 30].
- 43. On June 5, 2018, the Chapter 13 Trustee filed her Motion to Dismiss Case [Fifth Case Docket No. 37].
- 44. On June 7, 2018, Trinity filed its Stipulation for Adequate Protection re Section 362 Stay [Fifth Case Docket No. 39].
- 45. On June 14, 2018, the Court issued its Adequate Protection Order [Fifth Case Docket No. 45].
- 46. On June 15, 2018, Trinity filed its Notice of Default under Adequate Protection Order [Fifth Case Docket No. 46].
- 47. On June 20, 2018, the Debtor's Spouse filed her Opposition to Trustee's Motion to Dismiss Case [Fifth Case Docket No. 48].
 - 48. On September 21, 2018, the Court issued its Order and Notice of Dismissal [Fifth

1

- 49. On November 7, 2018, the case was closed [Fifth Case Docket No. 56].
- 3

4

- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 17

16

- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 27
- 28

SORENSEN, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW SANTA ANA

BURKE, WILLIAMS &

- 50. On October 15, 2018, a Notice of Sale was recorded with the sale scheduled for November 6, 2018, at 10:00 a.m.
- 51. On November 6, 2018, at 12:10 a.m., the day of the scheduled foreclosure sale, the Debtor filed the instant voluntary petition herein under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and was assigned Bankruptcy Case Number 2:18-bk-23070-SK [Docket No. 1].
- 52. On November 28, 2018, the Debtor filed his Plan providing for monthly payments to the Trustee in the amount of \$500 per month for 60 months.
- 53. The plan fails to provide for cure of the full pre-petition arrears owed to Trinity on account of its secured claim.
- 54. On December 21, 2018, Trinity filed its Proof of Claim secured by the Property with a total outstanding balance in the amount of \$66,185.16 and a pre-petition arrearage claim of \$31,050.93. See CCR, Claim No. 2-1.

III. ARGUMENT

- 55. The provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 1325 set forth the requirements for the Court to confirm a Chapter 13 Plan. The burden is on the debtor to demonstrate that the plan meets the conditions essential for confirmation. Warren v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. of N.Y. (In re Warren), 89 B.R. 87, 93 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1988). For the reasons detailed herein, the Debtor fails to meet this burden.
 - A. The Plan Cannot Be Confirmed Because It Does Not Provide for the Full **Value of Secured Creditors' Claims**
- 56. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii) requires a debtor's Chapter 13 Plan to distribute at least the allowed amount of a creditor's secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii). Furthermore, the requirement that a debtor provide for the full value of a creditor's secured claim is mandatory for plan confirmation. See Barnes v. Barnes (In re Barnes), 32 F. 3d 405, 407 (9th Cir. 1994); see also In re Lucas, 3 B.R. 252, 253 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1980) ("In order to confirm any Chapter 13 Plan, the court must be satisfied . . . that the plan meets all the requirements of §

3

9 10

8

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

26

27

25

28

1325(a)."). The burden lies with the debtor in demonstrating compliance with section 1325(a). Chinichian v. Campolongo (In re Chinichian), 784 F. 2d 1440 (9th Cir. 1986).

- 57. Trinity filed its Proof of Claim on account of its secured claim with a total outstanding balance in the amount of \$66,185.16 and a pre-petition arrearage claim of \$31,050.93. See CCR, Claim No. 2-1. However, the Debtor has only provided for pre-petition arrears to Trinity in the amount of \$22,728.28.
- 58. Section 1322(b)(2) states that a Chapter 13 plan may "modify the rights of holders of secured claims, other than a claim secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence." Trinity's claim is secured by the Property, which is the Debtor's principal residence. Thus, the plan may not modify Trinity's secured claim. See Nobelman v. Am. Sav. Bank, 508 U.S. 324, 329, 113 S. Ct. 2106, 2110, 124 L. Ed. 2d 228 (1993) (determination that bank's claim is partially secured "does not necessarily mean that the 'rights' the bank enjoys as a mortgagee, which are protected by § 1322(b)(2), are limited by the valuation of its secured claim.").
- 59. The Debtor's Plan cannot be confirmed as proposed because it fails to provide for Trinity's pre-petition arrears in full. The Plan therefore violates Sections 1322(b)(2) and (b)(5). As the Debtor's Plan fails to cure Trinity's claim, it also fails to satisfy 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii) and cannot be confirmed as proposed.

В. The Plan is Not Feasible

- 60. A reviewing court should confirm a plan only if it appears under all circumstances that the plan has a reasonable likelihood of success. *In re Craig*, 112 B.R. 224, 225 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio 1990) (citing *In re Anderson*, 28 B.R. 628, 630 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1982). Here, the Debtor has not provided sufficient evidence that his Chapter 13 plan is feasible.
- 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) requires debtors to be able to make all plan payments and 61. to comply with the terms set forth in the plan. The Debtor's Schedule J [Docket No. 1] indicates that the Debtor has monthly net income of \$273.00. However, the Debtor reaches this amount by omitting entirely any payment on his second lien with Trinity. *Id.* Then, the Debtor inexplicably goes on to commit \$1,250 a month to payments for his Plan—without saying where he will obtain

5

11

8

12 13 14

15

2.1 22

20

23

24

25

26

27

28

the extra funds. As the Debtor's monthly payments to Trinity are \$508.86 as of the date of filing [Claim No. 2], because he omitted monthly payments to Trinity from his schedules, the Debtor actually has negative net income of -\$235.86 before making any payments at all toward his Plan.

- 62. Trinity's proof of claim also lists \$31,050.93 in prepetition arrearages for the Debtor's second lien [Claim No. 2-1]. Spread over a maximum of sixty months, the Debtor will be required to pay \$517.52 monthly to the Plan in order to provide for a prompt cure of the prepetition arrears owed to Trinity in sixty (60) months, as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(5). As the monthly plan payment sufficient to cure Trinity's pre-petition arrears substantially exceeds the Debtor's available net income, the Debtor lacks any monthly disposable income with which to fund the Plan.
- 63. The Debtor clearly does not have the disposable income necessary to fund the Plan as proposed. Nor has the Debtor provided any documentation to explain where the additional funds would be coming from. As the Debtor already lists two rooms in his residence as being rented just to reach the purported net income of \$273 [Docket No. 1], it is unclear that the Debtor has any flexibility for obtaining further funding for the Plan. Moreover, the Debtor's monthly expenses are unrealistic, as the Debtor has failed to schedule any amounts for medical and dental expenses, health insurance, life insurance, property or homeowner's insurance, taxes, or indeed most expenditures. Accordingly, as the Plan is premised on the Debtor's rather optimistic schedules—which even in their best light afford the Debtor only \$273 a month—the Plan does not have a reasonable likelihood of success and cannot be confirmed as proposed. The Court should instead dismiss this case as just the latest effort by the Debtor to frustrate foreclosure.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Cas	Case 2:18-bk-23070-SK Doc 16 Filed 12/26/18 Entered 12/26/18 16:54:08 Desc Main Document Page 9 of 11			
1	IV.	CONCLUSION.		
2		Based on the foregoing, Trinity respectfully requests that the Plan not be confirmed and		
3	the cas	e dismissed.		
4				
5				
6	Dated:	December 26, 2018 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP		
7		N/a/ Pari		
8		By: Richard J. Reynolds Rafael R. Garcia-Salgado	-	
9		Rafael R. Garcia-Salgado Attorneys for Creditor TRINITY FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC.		
10		TRINITY FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC.		
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
AMS &	1		ı	